

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:

Dean James Patterson

Serial No.: 10/597,758

Filed: 08/07/06

For: Automated Manufacturing Machine

Attorney Docket No.: INMT 0102 PUSA

Group Art Unit: 3725

Examiner: Daniel C. Crane

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a response to the Restriction Requirement of May 16, 2008. Applicant elects with traverse to prosecute Group I comprising Claims 1-25 drawn to a punch and wind machine.

Applicant has elected to prosecute Group I with traverse as to Group II. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office reconsider the indication in their restriction requirement that Groups I and II do not relate to a single inventive entity under PCT Rule 13.1 and 13.2. The Examiner has indicated that "the method of Group II does have the same technical features as enumerated in Group I inventive concept because the control of the punching and winding can be independently sensed and actuated without regard to the winding operation". It is respectfully believed that this statement is untrue. There is only one winding operation which occurs when the mandrel is rotated and the strip or punch material is wound there about. A control means in claim 1 synchronizes the winding of the material about the mandrel with the punching of the slots so that the slots are appropriately lined up as the roll of wound material grows to the size of the finished slotted core. A finished slotted core is shown in Figure 5. It should be appreciated that the distance between slots are different when the core is initially being wound at the minimum OD corresponding to the mandrel as opposed to the distance between slots at the maximum core diameter when the finish slot wound core is completed.

It is believed that claim 1 drawn to the punch and winding machine and the method of forming a slot wound core of claim 26, are sufficiently related from a technical feature standpoint to constitute a single invention under the applicable unit of invention standard. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the restriction requirement between Groups I and II.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this application is requested. If the Examiner notes any minor errors, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that the matter can be promptly handled by Examiner's amendment.

Please charge the three month extension of time fee and any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**Dean James Patterson**

By: /John E. Nemazi/  
John E. Nemazi  
Reg. No. 30,876  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: September 16, 2008  
**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: (248) 358-4400  
Fax: (248) 358-3351